Luckemeyer v. Seltz, 61 Md. 313; Matthai v. Heather, 57 Md. 484; Price v. Piltzer, 44 Md. 521; Boyd v. Parker, 43 Md. 201; Whedbee v. Stewart, 40 Md. 421; Foley v. Bitter, 34 Md. 646; Crauford v. Austin, 34 Md. 51; Mackintosh v. Corner, 33 Md. 598; Laupheimer v. Rosenbaum, 25 Md. 219.

## Title and powers of trustee and creditors.

While a trustee takes property subject to valid liens, his control over it and right to recover it are not wholly limited to what the insolvent might do. The trustee represents all creditors. Applegarth v. Wagner, 86 Md. 472.

Where there is a fraudulent transfer of money and property, the insolvent trustee may sue therefor at law. Teackle v. Gibson, 8 Md. 87.

Where an insolvent has made a deed for the benefit of creditors which has been declared void, the property vests at once in insolvent trustee, and if any of such property has been sold, the proceeds belong to the trustee. Lynch v. Roberts, 57 Md. 153.

The insolvent trustee is the proper party to impeach a deed as fraudulent, and claim the property for use of creditors. Proof of fraud. Waters v. Dashiell, 1 Md. 472.

Where trustee refuses to institute proceedings to avoid a fraudulent conveyance, the creditors may do so themselves. Insolvent Estate of Leiman, 32 Md. 242; Jamison v. Chestnut, 8 Md. 38. But see Powles v. Dilley, 2 Md. Ch. 119.

Where creditors themselves attack a conveyance as fraudulent, insolvent trustee is a necessary party. Immediately upon setting aside of such a conveyance, title vests in trustee. Jamison v. Chestnut, 8 Md. 38. And see Swan v. Dent, 2 Md. Ch. 111.

Under act of 1829, ch. 208, sec. 3, the provisional trustee has as full power to sue for and recover property fraudulently conveyed as permanent trustee has. Teackle v. Gibson, 8 Md. 87.

## Generally.

If the facts tend to show that the insolvent has been guilty of acts prohibited by this section, it is the duty of the court to have issues framed. Jaeger v. Requardt, 25 Md. 241.

This section relates only to cases of insolvency. Triebert v. Burgess, 11 Md. 462. What a bill to set aside a conveyance under this section must allege. Ensor v. Keech, 64 Md. 380.

For a note upon fraudulent conveyances, see Swan v. Dent, 2 Md. Ch. 111.

For cases involving similar provisions of the bankrupt act, see Ecker v. Mc-Allister, 54 Md. 373; Ecker v. McAllister, 45 Md. 305.

For cases apparently no longer applicable to this section because of changes in the law, see Waters v. Riggin, 19 Md. 537; Brooks v. Thomas, 8 Md. 367; Stewart v. Union Bank, 7 Gill, 439; Gardner v. Lewis, 7 Gill, 379; Cole v. Albers, 1 Gill, 422; Crawford v. Taylor, 6 G. & J. 330; Brooks v. Thomas, 4 Md. Ch. 15. See also

See secs. 14 and 22 and notes.

As to conveyances from husband to wife, see art. 45, secs. 1 and 2.

An. Code, sec. 9. 1904, sec. 9. 1888, sec. 9. 1854, ch. 193, sec. 8.

Any judgment or decree confessed to give an undue preference to any creditor, or for the purpose of defrauding any creditor, shall be void and excluded in the distribution under this article.

If the facts tend to show that insolvent has been guilty of acts prohibited by this section, it is duty of court to have issues framed. Jaeger v. Requardt, 25 Md. 241. This section relates only to cases of insolvency. Triebert v. Burgess, 11 Md. 462.

An. Code, sec. 10. 1904, sec. 10. 1888, sec. 10. 1854, ch. 193, sec. 9.

Any creditor who shall collude with the insolvent to make his claim appear larger than it justly is shall forfeit the whole claim for the benefit of the other creditors.